DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 549 UD 020 548

AUTHOR Langlois, Margaret
TITLE ESEA Title I and Impact Aid. Final Evaluation Report, 1978-79.
INSTITUTION Community School District 28, Queens, N.Y.
PUB DATE 28 Sep 79
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Achievement Gains; Compensatory Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Remedial Mathematics; *Remedial Programs; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *Impact Aid; New York (Queens)

ABSTRACT

Through the Title I/Impact Aid programs, special reading and math services were provided for 2,385 students in grades one through nine. Three levels of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests were used as objective pre and post test measures. Pupil activities in reading varied according to diagnosed needs, grade level, and demonstrated task mastery. Cognitive tasks engaged in included perceptual training, auditory discrimination, vocabulary development, word analysis, reading comprehension, study and test taking skills, and leisure reading. Reading program evaluation indicated that third through ninth graders achieved 6-12 month gains in reading achievement grade equivalent scores. First and second grade students demonstrated a mean gain of six months. The Diagnostic Prescriptive Arithmetic program was utilized in math labs in conjunction with the Individualized Math System, teacher made materials, and instructional games. Evaluation of the math component showed mean grade equivalent gains of six months to one year. Data tables are included. (MK)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

APR 2 0 1980

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY SUPERINTENDENT
DISTRICT 28
BOARD OF EDUCATION

Telephone 544-2720

70-48 Austin Street
Forest Hills, New York 11375

Dr. Arnold Raisner
Community Superintendent

Cecelia K. Michael
Deputy Superintendent

ED186549

# FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

1978-79

ESEA TITLE I AND IMPACT AID

Title I Reading and Mathematics Umbrella
5087-91620

Source of Funding - Reading & O.A

Title I & ~~Optional Assign~~. I.A

Reading T.I 5087 - 91622

I.A 5087 - 98722

OA ~~O.A~~ T.F 5087 - 91624

I.A 5087 - 98724

Source of Funding - Math

Title I & ~~Optional Assign~~. I.A

math T.I 5087 - 91623

I.A 5087 - 98723

Prepared by: Margaret Langlois

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
NYC Bd of Ed
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UDO 20548

COMMUNITY DISTRICT 28

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

1978-79

ESEA TITLE I AND IMPACT AID (P.L. 81-874)

Official Copy of the Evaluation,
Approved as Submitted by the
Community School Superintendent
of District 28, on 9/28/ 1979

APPROVED: Arnold Raisner
Arnold Raisner, Ph.D.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 28Q 70-48 AUSTIN STREET FOREST HILLS, NEW YORK 11375

# E V A L U A T I O N

## TITLE I - IMPACT AID PROGRAMS

## SCHOOL YEAR 1978-79

PREPARED BY:

MARGARET LANGLOIS
EVALUATION, RESEARCH, STATISTICS

ARNOLD RAISNER, Ph.D.
COMMUNITY DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT

EDWARD GIBSON
COORDINATOR, REIMBURSABLE PROGRAMS

The programs undertaken under the Title I Umbrella were implemented in line with the approved project proposal. The 1978-79 Title I and Optional Assignment proposal, approved for New York Cith Board of Education, Community School District 28, contained three programs. Title I rosters for public schools spanned grades 2 through 9. Through these programs special service has been rendered to eligible pupils in curriculum areas of reading and mathematics and some 2385 pupils were serviced during 1978-79. The numbers of pupils programmed to participate in these programs (expected) and the numbers of pupils who participated (actual) are listed below by program and by school in Table I.

## TABLE I

### Title I Optional Assignment Program Participants, 1978 -79

### Title I Reading

| SCHOOL | NUMBER PUPILS EXPECTED | NUMBER PUPILS ACTUAL | NUMBER DATA SHEETS |
|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | 180 | 180 | 195 |
| 48* | 60 | 68 | 92 |
| 50* | 180 | 183 | 192 |
| 54 | 75 | 71 | 71 |
| 82 | 60 | 69 | 72 |
| 86 | 300 | 280 | 289 |
| 121 | 180 | 155 | 171 |
| 140 | 180 | 180 | 171 |
| 160* | 180 | 178 | 172 |
| 8 | 240 | 330 | 253 |
| 142 | 180 | 213 | 189 |
| TOTAL | 1815 | 1907 | 1867 |

*Includes Impact Aid 5087-98722

## Title I Mathematics

1.2

| School | Number Pupils Expected | Number Pupils Actual | Number Data Sheets |
|---|---|---|---|
| 40* | 60 | 60 | 60 |
| 48 | 60 | 50 | 50 |
| 50 | 60 | 55 | 58 |
| 54 | 60 | 60 | 59 |
| 82 | 60 | 63 | 60 |
| 86 | 60 | 60 | 58 |
| 121 | 60 | 45 | 40 |
| 140 | 60 | 60 | 51 |
| 160* | 60 | 61 | 45 |
| 8 | 60 | 68 | 54 |
| 142 | 60 | 77 | 67 |
| Total | 660 | 659 | 602 |

* Imcludes Impact Aid 5087-98723

## Title I Optional Assignment

1.3

| School | Number Pupils Expected | Number Pupils Actual | Number Data Sheets |
|---|---|---|---|
| 101* | 26 | 26 | 28 |
| 174 | 23 | 20 | 21 |
| 157 | 32 | 24 | 22 |
| 190 | 68 | 66 | 58 |
| Total | 149 | 136 | 129 |

* Includes Impact Aid 5087-98724

Title I rosters for District 28 Public schools span grades 2-9. A breakdown of the number of pupils in programs by school and grade is shown in Table II, which follows.

TABLE II

Title I & Optional Assignment, 1978-79

Program Participants by School and Grade

Title I Reading

2.1

| School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | | 46 | 33 | 50 | 51 | | | |
| 48 | | | | 36* | 32* | | | |
| 50 | | 39 | 44* | 54* | 46 | | | |
| 54 | | | 15 | 13 | 28 | 15 | | |
| 82 | | | 10 | 18 | 11 | 30 | | |
| 86 | 12 | 48 | 60 | 60 | 50 | 50 | | |
| 121 | | | 20 | 30 | 45 | 60 | | |
| 140 | | 60 | 11 | 49 | 60 | | | |
| 160 | | 48* | 57* | 44* | 29 | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | 251 | 79 |
| 142 | | | | | | 83 | 88 | 42 |

* Impact Aid added 5087-98722

Title I Optional Assignment

2.2

| School | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 101 | 7* | 6* | 6* | 7* | | | |
| 174 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | | | |
| 157 | | | | | 8 | 6 | 10 |
| 190 | | | | | 29 | 24 | 13 |

*Impact Aid added 5087-98724



7

## Title I Mathematics

2.3

| School | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | | | 15* | 27* | 18* | | | |
| 48 | 6 | 24 | 20 | | | | | |
| 50 | | | 34 | 21 | | | | |
| 54 | | | 36 | 24 | | | | |
| 82 | | | 24 | 13 | 14 | 12 | | |
| 86 | | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | | |
| 121 | | | 35 | 10 | | | | |
| 140 | | | 10 | 25 | 25 | | | |
| 160 | | | 36* | 25* | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | 37 | 15 | 16 |
| 142 | | | | | | 34 | 31 | 12 |

*Impact Aid added 5087-98723

Of the sixty-one staff assignments related directly to the servicing of pupils in the schools under the 1978-79 Title I Umbrella, $5087-91620, forty-three were Teachers, seventeen were Educational Assistants, and one an Audio Visual Technician. Assignments in programs by school are indexed in Table III.

## TABLE III

Title I & Optional Assignment, 1978-79
Staffing Assignments by School and Program

| SCHOOL | SUBJECT | TEACHERS | ED. ASSTS. | A.V. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Reading | 4 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | 1 | |
| 40 | Reading | 3 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | 1* | |
| 48 | Reading | 1 | 1* | |
| | Math | 1 (1*) | 1 | |
| 50 | Reading | 3 (1*) | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | | |
| 54 | Reading | 1 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | | |
| 82 | Reading | 1 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | 1 | |
| 86 | Reading | 5 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | | |
| 101 | OA Reading | | 1 | 1* |
| 121 | Reading | 3 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | | |
| 140 | Reading | 3 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | 1 | |
| 142 | Reading | 3 | 1 | |
| | Math | 1 | | |
| 157 | OA Reading | .5 | | |
| 160 | Reading | 3 (2*) | 1 | |
| | Math | 1* | | |
| 174 | OA Reading | .5 | | |
| 190 | OA Reading | 1 | | |
| Total Staff in schools | | 43 | 17 | 1 |

*Teachers and Paras funded by Impact Aid.

## T.I/OA TESTING PROGRAM

During 1978-79, the testing program was so structured that each participating T.I/OA pupil was administered a standardized test in October. Scoring was completed at the district office and lists of pupils with their scores were compiled from answer sheets and returned to the schools.

Each school received an adequate number of test booklets, answer sheets, and teacher directions. An orientation workshop was planned and carried out before pre-testing and before post-testing in order that teachers who administered tests would be thoroughly familiar with the specifics of the tests they would be giving. This orientation workshop follows this discussion.

Standardized test results can assist in providing objective measures of capability without being indebted to classroom achievement or subjective appraisal. Results can help the teacher to present the pupil with realistic pictures of his strengths and weaknesses as measured by a standardized test. An item analysis can be done at the option of the teacher. Results can also help her handle individual differences in pupils by indicating which children have the same or similar levels of skills in a particular subject. Results can help schools with grouping, planning, organizing and scheduling.

For Title I programs this year, the test used for pre-testing and post-testing in grades 3-9 was the Metropolitan Achievement Test, commonly referred to as the MAT. This test has three forms; F,G,H. These forms have been statistically equated. However, a perusal of outlines, or of the test themselves, will reveal slight differences in content from form to form. This year form G was used for pre-testing and form G for post-testing because SED mandated that the identical form be used pre and post and subtest scores were to be reported for each individual participant. The test used for pre-testing and post-testing in grades 1 and 2 was the California

Achievement Test (CAT). Level II was used in first grade; Level 12 in the second grade. Form C was used in both grades.

Metropolitan Achievement Tests for these grades are organized in three levels or batteries. The grade ranges appearing under the battary names are those for which the battary may appropriately be used. Pupils were tested on level.

| GRADES | BATTERY LEVELS |
|---|---|
| 3 - 4 | Elementary |
| 5 - 6 | Intermediate |
| 7 - 8 - 9 | Advanced |

## MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN READING AND MATH AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SCHOOL YEAR

For any school year pupils are eligible for Title I - Impact Aid programs on the basis of N.Y.C. reading test scores from the test administered the previous spring. If such scores are not available the most current standardized test score is used. For a few without such scores the pre-test score determines assignments to Title I remedial programs.

Once selected for the program all pupils are pre tested. Each pupil's score is compared at the end of the school year with his/her post test score.

Pre-test achievement data by program, school and grade for each Title I Program conducted during the Fall 1978 are presented in the tables beginning on page *10* of this report. Columns one and two cite the grade and number of pupils in each grade by school. The next column (column 3) shows the mean pre-test score of the pupils and the last column shows how far the grade equivalent mean achieved by each group is below what would have been expected as an average for that grade.

Expected grade averages for pupils whose achievement is on target at the beginning of October are as follows:

| GRADE | EXPECTED AVERAGE |
|---|---|
| 3 | 3.1 |
| 4 | 4.1 |
| 5 | 5.1 |
| 6 | 6.1 |
| 7 | 7.1 |
| 8 | 8.1 |
| 9 | 9.1 |

To the extent a pupil's score falls below the expected average he/she is not achieving at grade level. It is of interest to administrators and school personnel to know how far the pupils in a group fall below the expected average at the beginning of remedial work. In order to provide this information the group mean is computed.

To find the mean, pupils pre-test scores are added up, then divided by the number of such scores with the result called the average or mean. The expected average or mean is established by the test publishing company and is based on the grade plus the number of months school has been in session. For instance, a third grade class, tested the beginning of October, would ordinarily have a 3.1 or greater, grade equivalent average or mean. The tables following have beem completed for each school showing the grade and number of pupils serviced in columns 1 and 2. The grade equivalent average shown in column 3 on these tables for pupils participating in Title I - Impact Aid programs is based on the average or (or mean) of pre-test (MAT) scores for participating pupils. It falls below that would be expected by the amount (as measured in grade equivalent years and months) shown in column 4. A 100% sample has been used.

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

TABLE V

5.1

PROGRAM: Title I Reading — TEST: MAT

FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL A — DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2(CAT) | 41 | 1.3 | .9 |
| 3 | 32 | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| 4 | 50 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| 5 | 59 | 3.6 | 1.5 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

5.2

PROGRAM: Title I Reading — TEST: MAT

FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL B — DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 1 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 4** | 35 | 2.6 | 1.5 |
| 5** | 30 | 3.5 | 1.6 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

**Includes Impact Aide 5087-98722

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

5.3

PROGRAM: Title I Reading — TEST: MAT

FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL C — DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 36 | 1.3 | .8 |
| 3** | 45 | 1.8 | 1.3 |
| 4** | 48 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| 5 | 51 | 3.1 | 3.8 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

**Includes Impact Aid 5087-98722

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL
TABLE V

5.4
PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL D

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 13 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| 4 | 15 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| 5 | 28 | 3.5 | 1.6 |
| 6 | 14 | 3.7 | 2.4 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

5.5
PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL E

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 13 | 2.2 | 1.7 |
| 4 | 22 | 2.4 | 3.4 |
| 5 | 20 | 2.9 | 2.2 |
| 6 | 15 | 4.4 | 1.7 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October - 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

5.6
PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL F

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1(CAT) | 11 | 1.6 | .6 |
| 2(CAT) | 58 | 1.2 | .9 |
| 3 | 58 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| 4 | 59 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| 5 | 55 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
| 6 | 47 | 3.9 | 2.2 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL
TABLE V

5.7
PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL G

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 24 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| 4 | 37 | 2.5 | 1.6 |
| 5 | 57 | 3.3 | 1.8 |
| 6 | 72 | 3.7 | 2.4 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

5.8
PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL H

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2(CAT) | 45 | 1.2 | .9 |
| 3 | 11 | 1.7 | 1.4 |
| 4 | 47 | 2.6 | 1.5 |
| 5 | 60 | 3.0 | 2.1 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

5.8
PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL I

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2(CAT)** | 47 | 1.2 | .9 |
| 3** | 51 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 4** | 37 | 2.4 | 1.7 |
| 5 | 26 | 3.0 | 2.1 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1
**Includes Impact Aid 5087-98722

5.9

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL
TABLE V

PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL J

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 124 | 4.5 | 2.6 |
| 8 | 132 | 4.6 | 3.5 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

5.10

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

PROGRAM: Title I Reading
FUNCTION #: 5087-91622 SCHOOL K

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10.78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 76 | 3.9 | 2.2 |
| 7 | 72 | 3.9 | 3.2 |
| 8 | 37 | 5.6 | 2.5 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

TABLE VI

6.1 Title I

PROGRAM: Optional Assignment TEST: MAT

FUNCTION #: 5087-91624 SCHOOL L. DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3** | 7 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 4** | 8 | 2.9 | 1.2 |
| 5** | 6 | 3.6 | 1.5 |
| 6** | 7 | 4.4 | 1.7 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

**Includes Impact Aid 5087-98724

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

6.2 Title I

PROGRAM: Optional Assignment TEST: MAT

FUNCTION #: 5087-91624 SCHOOL M DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 7 | 4.1 | 3.0 |
| 8 | 7 | 4.9 | 3.2 |
| 9 | 9 | 5.9 | 3.7 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL

6.3 Title I

PROGRAM: Optional Assignment TEST: MAT

FUNCTION #: 5087-91624 SCHOOL N DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2(CAT) | 2 | 1.8 | .3 |
| 3 | 3 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 4 | 7 | 3.5 | .6 |
| 5 | 6 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
| 6 | 4 | 4.9 | 1.2 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1,

6.4 Title I

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCES IN READING BY GRADE LEVEL
TABLE V

PROGRAM: Optional Assignment
FUNCTION #: 5087-91624 SCHOOL C

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 29 | 5.1 | 2.0 |
| 8 | 18 | 5.9 | 2.2 |
| 9 | 9 | 6.4 | 2.7 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1,9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.1
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL A

TABLE VII

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 41 | 1.5 | .6 |
| 3** | 15 | 2.2 | .9 |
| 4** | 27 | 2.7 | 1.4 |
| 5** | 19 | 4.5 | .6 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1
**Includes Impact Aid 5087-98723

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.2
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL B

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 9 | .7 | .4 |
| 2 | 19 | 1.4 | .7 |
| 3 | 24 | 2.1 | 1.0 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.3
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL C

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 36 | 2.6 | .5 |
| 4 | 26 | 3.0 | 1.1 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.4
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL D

TABLE VII

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 35 | 2.2 | .9 |
| 4 | 24 | 3.0 | 1.1 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.5
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL E

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 23 | 2.1 | 1.0 |
| 4 | 13 | 2.8 | 1.3 |
| 5 | 14 | 3.7 | 1.4 |
| 6 | 9 | 4.9 | 1.2 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.6
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL F

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | 11 | 1.2 | .9 |
| 3 | 12 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 4 | 12 | 2.8 | 1.3 |
| 5 | 12 | 3.9 | 1.2 |
| 6 | 11 | 5.0 | 1.0 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.7
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL G

TABLE VII

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 32 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| 4 | 12 | 2.1 | 2.0 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.8
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL H

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 6 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| 4 | 24 | 2.4 | 1.7 |
| 5 | 25 | 3.8 | 1.3 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.9
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL I

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3** | 26 | 2.7 | .4 |
| 4** | 21 | 2.7 | 1.4 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1
**Includes Impact Aid 5087-98722

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.10
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL J

TABLE VII

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 52 | 5.6 | 2.5 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

MAGNITUDE OF DEFICIENCIES IN MATHEMATICS BY GRADE LEVEL

7.11
PROGRAM: Title I Math
FUNCTION #: 5087-91623 SCHOOL K

TEST: MAT
DATE: 10/78

| 1 Grade | 2 Sample Size | 3 Group Mean (Gr. E.) | 4 Distance Below* Expected Mean (Gr. E.) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 29 | 4.6 | 1.5 |
| 7 | 25 | 4.9 | 2.2 |
| 8 | 10 | 5.3 | 2.8 |

*Gr. Equiv. in October = 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 9.1

## TITLE I - OPTIONAL ASSIGNMENT READING PROGRAM INCLUDING IMPACT AID

TITLE I - 91622
O.A. - 91624
IMPACT TI - 98722
IMPACT OA - 98724

This program was designed to improve achievement in reading of eligible Title I pupils. The diagnostic-prescriptive approach to instruction was used. A Reading Laboratory Center was set up in each school to allow for pupils' varied interests and learning styles. So that all pupils would be exposed to many approaches, each pupil's weaknesses, strengths, as evidenced by diagnostic testing, was shared with him/her. A pupil's assignments were based on his/her needs and he/she was aware of this. The reading program is a "pull-out" where pupils were assigned for special remedial help five times a week for 45 minutes. Pupils met in groups of twelve.

Title I monies were allocated on the number of pupils from target areas in participating schools who scored below minimum competency on city-wide reading achievement tests. Once a pupil was determined eligible to participate in the program, his/her needs were determined by: standardized tests; diagnostic tests; informal tests; criterion-referenced tests; interest inventory; and teacher evaluation.

Special forms were devised for the reading program. Test results and skill needs were recorded on a Profile sheet. Assignments were recorded on a Pupil Daily Record by the teacher and/or pupil and this record was kept in the individual pupil's folder. Pupils were involved in recordkeeping.

Pupil activities varied according to diagnosed needs, grade level, and demonstrated task mastery. The cognitive tasks engaged in included: perceptual training; auditory discrimination; vocabulary development; word analysis; reading comprehension; study skills; test taking skills; and leisure reading.

Pupils worked individually and in flexible small groups based on common needs and interests. Involvement in his/her own learning was essential to the success of the program. Each was given only one or two skills to work on at a time to prevent

frustration. Pupils were taught how to use materials, check their work, and plot their own progress. They picked out their folders, read the assignment, got the necessary materials, did the work, checked it and returned the materials. Equipment, materials and supplies used included: 1) Barnell Loft, Ltd-Specific Skills Series used by seven of the eleven schools; 2) Random House-High Intensity Program was used by two of the eleven schools; 3) C.B.S. and New York Times pilot television reading program, "Home to Stay" was used by four of the eleven schools; 4) SRA-Reading Program was used by three of the eleven schools; 5) Reader's Digest-Reading Program was used by two of the eleven schools; 6) Primary Pathways of Reading; 7) Developmental Learning Materials-Sound Foundation; 8) Teacher-made materials and, 9) Commercial Reading Games.

Frequent reading conferences held by the teacher or educational assistant with the pupil was an important part of the program. Teachers personally interacted with individual pupils and worked with small groups giving guidance and support. They supplied on-the-spot aid when materials were not appropriate for an individual pupil or were not available. Teachers made frequent checks on each pupil's program and made necessary changes regarding pupil goals. Formal evaluation of pupils' progress was done twice or three times during the year. There was increased emphasis on reading whole stories and whole books so that pupils could see the relationship between skill learning and the total reading process.

While each teacher had a supply of interesting workbooks, kits, and tapes for skill development, the thrust was to get pupils to read books. The introduction of paperback books provided strong motivation to pupils. Reading materials were very varied and went from skill comics to the classics. In between were all kinds of books on how to make things in addition to science, history, informational books, poetry, and plays. In addition, there were books with tapes so that students could listen to stories which were leveled above their ability. Such a complet diet of reading materials made it difficult for pupils not to find something to their liking.

Pupils selected their books for independent reading, then paced their reading and discussed what they read with the teacher and other pupils.

Pupils on the primary level practiced and learned their vowels with a set of primary vowel readers. Junior High pupils sharpened their skills with stories and plays where they made up different endings.

Teachers were responsible for establishing an attractive learning environment. Reading centers, on the whole, were nicely decorated and each reading area had comfortable chairs, pads, etc. Teachers reported that having the reading area in each center and allowing pupils to read and borrow books during center time has resulted in requests to sign out more and more books. Many pupils found more enjoyment in reading and developed the habit of seeking information through the written word.

Monthly workshops for teachers were planned around requests from teachers. The success of the workshops was centered around the sessions of idea-swapping, exchange of new ideas, showing old ideas with new format. The workshops were held in different schools each month which afforded teachers in the program the opportunity of seeing how other teachers maintain and run their centers and provided an opportunity to view new techniques being used. Each workshop provided time for demonstration of materials so teachers could be kept abreast of new materials. Teacher presentations reviewed a variety of teaching techniques.

In between workshops, visits were made to each of the schools by reading specialist so that teachers could receive individual assistance. Teachers visited the District Office to choose materials which would correspond with the specific level of development of their pupils.

Four teachers undertook a "Book of the Week" program. In this program teachers read excerpts from books written on a more difficult level in order to give the pupils additional satisfying reading experience and inspired further motivation.

Reading Staff performance showed a narrower range of ratings than in previous years. Twenty-one of the thirty-two professional staff members' performances were

characterized as good, being tightly structured and reflective of excellent classroom management. Seven could be rated fair and the remaining four were rated poor. Daily logs, pupil attendance records, updated lists of pupils in the program (discharges, transfers, and admissions), and pupil profile achievement records were adequately kept by almost all teachers.

Physical facilities were rated from adequate to excellent in areas of availability, adequacy and appropriateness.

Pupils in all grades were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test pre and post (10/78-5/79). For grades 3-9, 39 grades within 15 schools achieved at least a six month gain in grade equivalent score units and, of these, ten showed an average of more than a year's growth. At the 2nd grade level a gain of six months in grade equivalent units was evident in one of the six schools and one school with a 1st grade class showed a six month gain. It would appear that there was very little growth. However, these pupils were working with word attack and other developmental skills and had not reached the point of integrating these skills. The CAT did not test these skills but tested mostly comprehension. Tables illustrating these findings by school and grade appear on pages 25 to 28.

The reading program in District 28 has improved each year. The program during 1978-79 was better organized and better supervised than the well-received 977-78 program and must be judged superior to programs of previous years. Teachers were more experienced and had improved their teaching skills. It appears that many principals assigned master teachers to this remedial program.

Recommendations are as follows:

1. The need to follow through with individual pupils from elementary to intermediate school in terms of ascertaining need, determining type of service, and checking on achievement has been partially met with the introduction of re-capping (adding 6th grade in Elementary schools thus eliminating I. S. schools). Additional planning and implementation must be undertaken to further meet this need.
2. There is a need to begin preventive service in first and second grades and such service has, during 978-79, been partially coordinated with PSEN. There remains

a need to continue with the development of a comprehensive program.

3. Parent involvement can only develop the intensity needed when an organized structured program is offered. The need is evident.

4. Pupil achievement depends on consistent service as well as adequate time. There are occasions when sudden emergencies may necessitate the cancellation of Title I classes. When sc directed by school principals such changes should be cleared with Title I administration. Such changes should not be arbitrary nor capricious.

5. Real growth in achievement was not evident in grades 6 - 9 to any significant extent. Therefore, there is a need to give this problem much thought and to plan a different approach and a program for pupils in these grades.

6. HEW research*as shown that secondary students gain more in reading in classrooms where the teacher provides considerable structure and the pupils are working on prescribed tasks most of the time. More gain was found where teachers spend more time instructing, discussing homework, providing considerable supportive feedback, and having students read aloud in small groups, thus staying involved with pupils all of the class period. These findings should be kept in mind when planning for JHS pupils' special reading service.

* Executive Summary "How to Change the Process of Teaching Basic Reading Skills in Secondary Schools" by Jane Stallings, Ph.D., SRI International, May, 1979.

Reading

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL A — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 2 | 41 | 1.3 | 1.4 | .1 |
| | | 3 | 32 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 1.1 |
| | | 4 | 50 | 2.5 | 3.3 | .8 |
| | | 5 | 59 | 3.6 | 4.5 | .9 |

SCHOOL B — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 4* | 35 | 2.6 | 3.3 | .7 |
| *Impact Aid Reading | 5087-98722 | 5* | 30 | 3.5 | 4.4 | .9 |

*Impact Aid Included

SCHOOL C — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 2 | 36 | 1.3 | 1.2 | -.1 |
| | | 3* | 45 | 1.8 | 2.5 | .7 |
| *Impact Aid Reading | 5087-98722 | 4* | 48 | 2.3 | 2.9 | .6 |
| | | 5 | 51 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 1.0 |

*Impact Aid Included

SCHOOL D — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 3 | 13 | 1.9 | 2.3 | .4 |
| | | 4 | 15 | 2.5 | 3.2 | .7 |
| | | 5 | 28 | 3.5 | 4.3 | .8 |
| | | 6 | 14 | 3.7 | 4.5 | .8 |

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL E — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 3 | 13 | 2.2 | 2.8 | .6 |
| | | 4 | 22 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 1.0 |
| | | 5 | 20 | 2.9 | 3.8 | .9 |
| | | 6 | 15 | 4.4 | 5.0 | .6 |

SCHOOL F — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 1 | 11 | .6 | 1.2 | .6 |
| | | 2 | 58 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 0 |
| | | 3 | 58 | 1.5 | 2.4 | .9 |
| | | 4 | 59 | 2.3 | 3.2 | .9 |
| | | 5 | 55 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 1.0 |
| | | 6 | 47 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 1.0 |

SCHOOL L — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Optional Assign. Reading | 5087-91624 | 3* | 7 | 2.0 | 2.7 | .7 |
| | | 4* | 8 | 2.9 | 3.8 | .9 |
| *Impact Aid O.A. Reading | 5087-98724 | 5* | 6 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 1.3 |
| | | 6* | 7 | 4.4 | 5.0 | .6 |

*Impact Aid Included

SCHOOL G — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 3 | 24 | 1.6 | 2.5 | .9 |
| | | 4 | 37 | 2.5 | 3.1 | .6 |
| | | 5 | 57 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 1.3 |
| | | 6 | 72 | 3.7 | 5.3 | 1.6 |

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL H — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 2 | 45 | 1.2 | 1.8 | .6 |
| | | 3 | 11 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 1.5 |
| | | 4 | 47 | 2.6 | 3.3 | .7 |
| | | 5 | 60 | 3.0 | 6.2 | 3.2 |

SCHOOL M — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Optional Assign. Reading | 5087-91624 | 7 | 7 | 4.1 | 5.5 | 1.4 |
| | | 8 | 7 | 4.9 | 5.3 | .4 |
| | | 9 | 9 | 5.9 | 6.6 | .7 |

SCHOOL I — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 2* | 47 | 1.2 | 1.7 | .5 |
| | | 3* | 51 | 2.0 | 2.7 | .7 |
| *Impact Aid Reading | 5087-98722 | 4* | 37 | 2.4 | 2.9 | .5 |
| | | 5 | 26 | 3.0 | 3.6 | .6 |

*Impact Aid Included

SCHOOL N — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Optional Assign. Reading | 5087-91624 | 2 | 2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 0 |
| | | 3 | 3 | 2.0 | 2.5 | .5 |
| | | 4 | 7 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 0 |
| | | 5 | 6 | 3.7 | 4.5 | .8 |
| | | 6 | 4 | 4.9 | 4.9 | 0 |

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL J — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 7 | 124 | 4.5 | 4.9 | .4 |
| | | 8 | 132 | 4.6 | 5.2 | .6 |

SCHOOL K — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Reading | 5087-91622 | 6 | 76 | 3.9 | 4.6 | .7 |
| | | 7 | 72 | 3.9 | 4.5 | .6 |
| | | 8 | 37 | 5.6 | 5.8 | .2 |

SCHOOL O — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Optional Assign. Reading | 5087-91624 | 7 | 29 | 5.1 | 5.2 | .1 |
| | | 8 | 18 | 5.9 | 6.4 | .5 |
| | | 9 | 9 | 6.4 | 6.4 | 0 |

# TITLE I MATHEMATICS PROGRAM INCLUDING IMPACT AID

TITLE I - 91623
IMPACT AID - 98723

The Title I Mathematics Program was designed to improve the math achievement of eligible pupils. Utilizing a diagnostic prescriptive approach to instruction each student was involved in his/her own self improvement. He/she was made aware of strengths and weaknesses and with this knowledge proceeded with designated assignments. At different times each student worked individually or in small groups.

This year (1978-79) Title I math labs in District 28 decreased to eleven. The decrease was a result in one school's loss of eligible students.

The DPA, (Diagnostic Prescriptive Arithmetic) program was utilized in each of the eleven math labs. While each teacher in the program took a slightly different approach, successful implementation at three schools was especially apparent in monitoring. The teacher at one school developed a cross referenced comprehensive index system, on level, for every material and activity in her lab. This simplified the task of assigning more than one student to any specific activity. The teacher at another school developed a system of articulation which permitted her to discuss an individual pupil's need with classroom teachers and allowed her to utilize the information she received in her planning. The most outstanding program was found to be operating in an intermediate school where excellent classroom organization, full pupil participation, high pupil motivation were evidenced.

All teachers utilized a combination of D.P.A., I.M.S. (Individualized Math System), teacher made materials and instructional games.

Each teacher in the program kept a record of each pupil's work, his attendance, and a report on that pupil's achievement. The teachers were provided with sample material resources for the preparation of teacher made materials as well as "hands on" manipulative materials.

The 1978-79 school year has seen even greater interest in the Title I Math

Program. Results show significant improvement in pupil's achievement. Twenty-eight of the thirty one grades in eleven schools showed improvement in mean grade equivalent units of 6 months or more. Of these, twelve grades in eight schools had a mean gain of 1.0 or more. Third grade pupils exceeded those of other grades in terms of net gain. Tables of findings by grade and school are on pages 31 to 33

Staff performance was generally rated good with three of the eleven teachers rated fair and one poor. A series of workshops given to assist teachers in implementing the new program was credited with the improvement in staff performance. These will be continued in 1979-80.

Recommendations for the program are:

1. There is a need to follow through with individual pupils from elementary to intermediate school in terms of ascertaining need, determining type of service, and checking on achievement.
2. There is a need to begin preventive service in first and second grades and thus continuing coordination with PSEN to produce a comprehensive program.
3. Parent involvement can only develop the intensity needed when an oganized structured program is offered.
4. Pupil achievement depends on consistent service as well as adequate time. There are occasions when sudden emergencies may necessitate the cancellation of Title I classes. When so directed by school principals, such changes should be cleared with Title I administration.
5. The very successful program at one I.S. school should be replicated at the other.
6. A review of the literature strongly indicates that achievement in math anticipates growth in reading achievement. It is strongly recommended that the Title I Math Program be expanded in view of this strong evidence.

Math

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL A — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 2 | 41 | 1.5 | 2.1 | .6 |
| | | 3* | 15 | 2.2 | 3.1 | + .9 |
| *Impact Aid Math | 5087-98723 | 4* | 27 | 2.7 | 3.4 | + .7 |
| | | 5* | 19 | 4.5 | 5.2 | .7 |

*Impact Aid Included

SCHOOL B — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-81623 | 1 | 9 | .7 | 1.3 | .6 |
| | | 2 | 19 | 1.4 | 2.3 | .9 |
| | | 3 | 24 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 1.0 |

SCHOOL C — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 3 | 36 | 2.6 | 3.3 | + .7 |
| | | 4 | 26 | 3.0 | 3.6 | + .6 |

SCHOOL D — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 3 | 35 | 2.2 | 3.5 | 1.3 |
| | | 4 | 24 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 1.1 |

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL E — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 3 | 23 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 1.2 |
| | | 4 | 13 | 2.8 | 3.7 | .9 |
| | | 5 | 14 | 3.7 | 4.6 | .9 |
| | | 6 | 9 | 4.9 | 6.2 | 1.3 |

SCHOOL F — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 2 | 11 | 1.2 | 1.9 | .7 |
| | | 3 | 12 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 1.6 |
| | | 4 | 12 | 2.8 | 3.7 | .9 |
| | | 5 | 12 | 3.9 | 4.8 | .9 |
| | | 6 | 11 | 5.0 | 6.2 | 1.2 |

SCHOOL G — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 3 | 32 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 1.3 |
| | | 4 | 12 | 2.1 | 3.7 | 1.6 |

SCHOOL H — 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 3 | 6 | 1.6 | 2.3 | .7 |
| | | 4 | 24 | 2.4 | 3.5 | 1.1 |
| | | 5 | 25 | 3.8 | 4.7 | .9 |

COMPARISON OF TITLE I-IMPACT AID PRETEST & POSTTEST
MEAN GR. EQUIV. SCORES BY SCHOOL & GRADE

SCHOOL I 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 3* | 26 | 2.7 | 2.8 | .1 |
| *Impact Aid Math | 5087-98723 | 4* | 21 | 2.7 | 2.0 | - .7 |

*Impact Aid Included

SCHOOL J 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 8 | 52 | 5.6 | 6.7 | 1.1 |

SCHOOL K 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Title I Math | 5087-91623 | 6 | 29 | 4.6 | 5.2 | .6 |
| | | 7 | 25 | 4.9 | 6.0 | 1.1 |
| | | 8 | 10 | 5.3 | 5.2 | - .1 |

SCHOOL 1978 - 1979

| PROGRAM | FUNCTION # | GRADE | # OF PUPILS | PRETEST MEAN GR. EQ. | POSTTEST MEAN GR. EQ. | DIFFERENCE (+/-) GR.EQ. YR. & MO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | |

## EXPANSION OF PROGRAMMING AND CALCULATOR CAPABILITY

The Evaluation Office utilizes a Hewlett Packard 9830A Programmable Calculator with a 9866A printer and 9865A Extension Cassette Tape Drive.

This year grade equivalent scores were generated on the 9830A from raw scores that had been preciously retrieved from feeding answer sheets through the 3M scoring machine. Pupil lists with both types of scores were then forwarded to schools. However, grade equivalent scores are no longer used in reporting to SED. Raw scores for each of the subtests administered in reading or math together with appropriate percentile scores are required.

Thus, SED evaluation requires each individual pupil's raw pre test and post test subtest scores be submitted. Percentiles, also required, for these scores, were entered by hand since machine handling of this test would have required more memory than the machine contains. Each pupil's pre-test raw and percentile scores on subtests of Metropolitan Achievement Test (3-9) or the California Achievement Test (K, 1, and 2) must be submitted with his/her post-test subtest raw percentile scores. For District 28 Title I evaluation purposes during 1978-79, scores were collected for each pupil in each program by school.

For the last five years our data analysis techniques have been based on the use of the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading and Math in grades 3-9. Normed out on New York City pupils, grade Equivalent scores on the test would be considered to be slightly on the conservative side and in the middle range when compared with other commonly used standardized reading and math test scores.

In previous years we have applied a t-ratio to an actual post test comparison to the predicted post-test scheme of data analysis in each grade in each school and across each grade.

This year we have entered some 65 pieces of information for each pupil in the

program in addition to 17 pieces of information in a header file for each school grade. Data has been collected on the cassette tapes used with our Hewlett Packard 9830A. Using our machine as a terminal these data are then transferred from cassettes to nine track magnetic tape via a telephone hook-up with the DEC PDP 11/70 Central headquarters. The resulting magnetic tape with complete data is submitted to the Bureau of School and Categorical Programs Evaluation of the State Education Department in Albany.

The evaluation office has been fortunate to have the help of an expert in many phases of computer work. Five years ago one of the Junior High School teachers in the district asked if he could bring in his pupils in small groups to demonstrate the operations and programming of the machine. In return, some of the pupils under his supervision would help with our programming. This endeavor met with great success. When the reporting format mandated by the State became more complex we were able to budget a small number of hours for a teacher assigned and asked this same teacher if he could devote more time to our programming. He agreed and we have continued funding his services on an hourly basis since. His generosity, with time and our ability to capitualize on our district resources, has resulted in great savings and a superior product which has won for our district approval and praise from city and state administrators. At the present time we have some forty-five programs to collect data, generate converted scores, complete statistical analysis, format, update and print information mandated by SED, and expedite calculation----all very specialized to meet the needs of our district evaluation.

## CONSULTANTS

Consultants are temporary, occasional personnel who are employed to help in the appraisal and monitoring of those specialized and technical aspects of a program. They are persons with expertise in those areas for which they are employed.

Two types of consultants have been employed for evaluation of Title I - Impact Aid programs in District 28. The first type, program consultant, helps with planning appraisal and evaluation of ongoing school programs. The second type, a statistical support consultant, supplies expertise in statistical analysis and works with test scores. During 1978-79 the service of a program consultant was used exclusively.

The program consultant helped with monitoring of ongoing programs. She visited classes in schools; checked starting and stopping times; checked participants; made note of teacher's methods of instruction; recorded teacher strengths and weaknesses and his/her relationship with pupils and paraprofessionals; checked the adequacy of facilities and materials as to their being available, adequate, appropriate, and constructively used; reported on duties and time of paraprofessionals; prepared a formal report of each class visited as well as an informal report on the school program, consulted with Title I staff findings, and made recommendations regarding same.

In District 28 we have formulated a policy summarized below for consultants who serve Title I in the Evaluation program. It can be summarized as follows:

1. Each applicant for consultant must complete a form, "Request Approval of Consultant Nomination and Pay Rate", and submit it with a resume. This form is then submitted to the Coordinator of Reimbursable Programs and to the District Superintendent for approval.
2. Each applicant must be personally interviewed.

3. Forms approved at the District Office level are then sent to the Bureau of Alternate Assignment at 65 Court Street. An approval for Employment of Consultant form is returned to the District Office from the Office of Personnel.
4. A letter is forwarded to the Principal of each school with a Title I - Optional Assignment program advising him/her of the appointment to be made by consultants.
5. Each consultant makes his/her own appointment with each school principal after consultation with the District Office Research Associate.
6. Each consultant is required to complete a time log. Time spent at the District Office is also recorded on a consultant's log.
7. A time sheet is submitted at appropriate intervals, usually monthly, and processed for payment.
8. Consultants who monitor programs must submit a completed Program Report as well as an informal report for each class, grade, school and teacher visited.

The form used for program reports by such consultants is reproduced on the following page

With this type of comprehensive evaluation program we can better address ourselves to the stated objectives of the programs we are measuring, enhance program efficiency and make recommendations for program expansion, contraction, modification or validation.

NYC Board of Education

Community School District 23Q
1978-79

Date_____

# PROGRAM REPORT

Program observed

Function # ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

☐ T I Read ☐ T I Math ☐ T I ESL ☐ PreK Exp. ☐ ESEA T 7 ☐ Sp. Needs ☐ TAP ☐ Bil. Mod 30 ☐ Other

School ☐☐☐ Grade ☐ Class ☐ Teacher_____

1. Has this teacher been with this class from the beginning of the program?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No If not, who formerly held the position_____

2. Program Treatment Time
   Days per week ☐☐☐☐☐ Length of Time per Day Hours ☐ Minutes ☐ Time Class Observed ☐☐ : ☐☐ No. Pupils in Class ☐☐

3. Has teacher completed any sections of Pupil Data Profile forms for this class? Yes ☐ No ☐

4. Does teacher have any suggestions/criticisms pertaining to this program/class/group? If so, please explain _____ Yes ☐ No ☐

5. Is the method of instruction conducted in accordance with proposal objectives? If no, please explain_____ Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Was there anything outstanding in this particular learning situation which could be viewed as a notable contribution to the program? If yes, please explain _____ Yes ☐ No ☐

7. What program/teacher strengths are evident in this class?

8. What program/teacher weaknesses are evident in this class?

9. Adequacy of facilities and materials:

| STATUS | FACILITIES Yes | FACILITIES No | MATERIALS Yes | MATERIALS No |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Were they available? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| B. Were they adequate? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| C. Were they appropriate? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| D. Were they constructively used? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

10. Does this class have the services of a paraprofessional. Yes ☐ No ☐
    Has this para been with this class since the program began.
    Please check para's duties

- ☐ A. None
- ☐ B. Activities not related to instruction.
- ☐ C. Assist with pupils' classroom work
- ☐ D. Helping pupils with personal activities
- ☐ E. Preparation of materials

# of periods or amount of time with teacher
- ☐ Full Time
- ☐ More than half
- ☐ Half
- ☐ Less than half

Name of Paraprofessional_____

11. Do any practices or procedures used with this group dove-tail with other programs in the school or does subject matter correlate with other work taken in the school? ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, explain_____

Name of person completing this report_____Date_____

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE

3812

Please list the children in this class

1. _____ 8. _____
2. _____ 9. _____
3. _____ 10. _____
4. _____ 11. _____
5. _____ 12. _____
6. _____ 13. _____
7. _____ 14. _____
15. _____

What activity is taking place in the classroom while you are observing? _____

_____

_____

_____

What curriculum approach/method underlies the sequence of instruction in this class? _____

_____

_____

_____

Are any of the children in this class participating in any other program of the same kind (reading, math, or ESL) in this same school? _____

_____

Did this class start promptly? YES _____ NO _____

Did pupils arrive on time? YES _____ NO _____

Was the class dismissed at the scheduled time? YES ____ NO ____

Did any of the pupils leave early? YES _____ NO _____